

REMARKS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending telephonic interviews on September 11 and 21, 2007. During the interviews, applicants' representative presented draft amendments and arguments for their patentability similar to those in the present Response. The Examiner indicated that the amendments require further considerations. Thus, no agreement has been reached regarding the patentability of the claims.

OBJECTIONS and REJECTIONS

Claims 12-15, 20, and 22-70 were pending when last examined. With this Response, applicants have canceled claims 13, 15, 23, 29, 37, 44, 51, 58, and 65; amended claims 12, 14, 20, 22, 24-28, 30-34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52-55, 57, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66, 68, and 69; and added claims 71-76. All pending claims are shown in the detailed listing above. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 2, 7, 8, 11 and 12, and in the corresponding description in the specification. *See*, for example, paragraphs 43-47, 50-52, 57-62.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed on Sept. 22, 2006, to paragraph 44 of the specification because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Although applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion, the amendment to paragraph 44 is hereby canceled in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed on May 12, 2004, to paragraph 47 of the specification because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Although applicants

respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion, the amendment to paragraph 47 is hereby canceled in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 12-15, 20, and 22-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Although applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion, the claims have been amended to delete all reference to "metadata." Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are fully supported by the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 12-15, 20, and 22-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,847,977 to Abajian ("Abajian"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 12, as amended, recites a method for supplying electronic documents. The method includes supplying from a provider of a program broadcasting system to a client in the program providing system an electronic document that uses XML to describe programming information about a plurality of television broadcast programs scheduled for broadcast in the program broadcasting system. The electronic document has a hierarchical structure including an upper fragment and a plurality of lower fragments located below the upper fragment in the hierarchical structure to describe, for each of the scheduled television broadcast programs, a program identifier, a title, broadcast information and corresponding program content information. The method further includes supplying from the provider to the client an update document to update content in the previously supplied electronic document. The update document includes the upper fragment and an invalid element to identify an invalid content portion in one of the lower fragments in the hierarchical structure, wherein the invalid content portion is related to one of the television broadcast programs

described in the previously supplied electronic document, and wherein the update document indicates deletion of said invalid content portion from the electronic document according to the invalid element.

Abajian discloses grouping metadata search results associated with media on a computer network. *See* Abstract of Abajian. Although Abajian discloses that the metadata can include an electronic program guide of High Definition television broadcast (see Abajian at col. 4:53-62), it fails to disclose that, in a program broadcasting system, a previously supplied electronic document, which describes programming information about television broadcast programs and has a hierarchical structure including an upper fragment and a plurality of lower fragments, is updated using an update document that includes the upper fragment and an invalid element to identify an invalid content portion in one of the lower fragments in the hierarchical structure, and wherein the update document indicates deletion of the invalid content portion from the electronic document -- as required by claim 12. Because Abajian fails to disclose at least the above limitations, claim 12 should be allowable. Claim 14 depends from claim 12, and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 20, 22, 28, 36, 43, 50, 57 and 64 recite a previously supplied electronic document and an update document that have limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 12. Because Abajian fails to disclose at least these limitations, independent claims 20, 22, 28, 36, 43, 50, 57 and 64 should be allowable. Dependent claims 24-27, 30-35, 38-42, 45-49, 52-56, 59-63, and 66-70 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

New Claims

Claims 71-76 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims discussed above.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7428.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/5/07 Richard A. Pask
Date Signature

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Registration No. L0078
FP/rp

November 5, 2007

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715